

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached drawing sheets includes a revisions to FIG. 1, as further described in the Remarks.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 1 including FIG. 1

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 2 and 5 - 46 are presently pending, with claims 1, 3 and 4 having previously been cancelled. Applicant cancels claims 22 and 30 without prejudice or disclaimer, and amends claims 2, 23, 25, 27 and 31. No new matter is introduced. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, at page 48, line 4 through page 53, line 2 of Applicant's specification, and with reference to Applicant's FIG. 1 and cancelled claims 22 and 30.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 6 and 27 are rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 on the basis of the written disclosure and enablement requirements. Specifically, the Examiner finds that the claimed "second medium" coupling a plurality of remote management devices to the remote management unit is not disclosed in the specification. As claim 1 is canceled and claim 27 makes no claim reference to a second medium, Applicant infers that the rejection is in fact directed to claims 2 and 6.

Claim 2, for example, claims the "second medium" as coupling "a plurality of remote networking devices [] to the remote management unit." Applicant submits that the second medium is depicted, for example, in FIG. 1 as the illustrated links between the remote management unit 109 and remote servers 113a, 113b. Applicant submits a revised drawing sheet that updates FIG. 1 by assigning reference numerals 122a, 122b to the illustrated links, and amends the specification to describe the links 122a, 122b.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed "second medium" of claims 2 and 6 is adequately disclosed in the specification, and request therefore that the rejections of claims 2 and 6 under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 5 - 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0083266 A1 to Comstock et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,271,822 to Chiang.). As claims 22 and 30 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejections as to claims 22 and 30 are moot. Applicant amends claims 12, 23, 25, 27 and 31 to further clarify the nature of his invention, and respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 2, 5 - 21, 23 - 29 and 31 - 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Comstock discloses a system for managing media in a multimedia conferencing system (see, e.g., abstract of Comstock). The system that includes a content digitizer for digitizing content provided in an analog form, and a content codec which arguably compresses as well as encodes the digital content prior to transmitting the data over a network. However, and as acknowledged by the Examiner, Comstock fails to teach an LCD controller for converting analog signals to a digital form. The Examiner suggest however that this deficiency is overcome with the addition of Chiang.

Chiang discloses a digital liquid crystal display driving circuit which is provided for driving a LCD to display video images (see, e.g., abstract of Chiang). As illustrated for example by FIG. 2 of Chiang, the driving circuit 300 is configured to receive a digital signal from a display memory 202, to process the digital signal for correction in gamma correction and inversion circuit 221, and to convert the processed signal to an analog form in D/A converter 222 for display on an LCD display.

In sharp contrast to Chiang's driving circuit, the LCD controller of the remote management unit claimed in amended independent claim 2 is configured to receive an analog signal from a video output of a remote device, to convert the analog signal to a digital signal in an A/D converter, to image correct the digital signal and to provide the corrected signal to a video processing circuit for compressing the corrected signal so that it may be transferred to a workstation. In other words, the LCD controller of the remote management unit of claim 2 is configured not for directly controlling an LCD display as in the case of Chiang, but rather for image-correcting a video signal prior to its compression and transmission from the remote

management unit to a plurality of workstations. Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art at the time of the present invention would not have found it obvious to employ an LCD controller in the manner claimed by Applicants on the basis of what is taught by Chiang. Rather, and at most, Chiang may arguably have suggested the use of an LCD controller in the workstation upon receipt of the digital signals to perform image correction and D/A conversion on the received digital signals in order to drive an associated LCD display.

Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art at the time of the present invention familiar with Comstock and Chiang would not have been motivated to configure an LCD controller in a remote management unit for coupling workstations to remote networking devices in the manner claimed by Applicant in amended independent claim 2, absent Applicant's specification as a roadmap. Thus, the combination of Comstock and Chiang to arrive at the invention claimed by amended independent claim 2 necessarily constitutes impermissible hindsight.

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that amended independent claim 2 is not obvious in view of the cited references and stands in condition for allowance. Applicant further submits that this reasoning is in addition applicable to the rejection of amended independent claim 27, which claims a method for operating a remote management unit having an LCD controller configured to receive an analog signal from a video output of a remote device, to convert the analog signal to a digital signal in an A/D converter, to image correct the digital signal and to provide the corrected signal to a video processing circuit for compressing the corrected signal so that it may be transferred to a workstation. Accordingly, Applicant submits that amended independent claim 27 also stands in condition for allowance.

As claims 5 - 21, 23 - 26, 28, 29 and 31 - 46 each depend either directly or indirectly from one of allowable independent claims 2 and 27, Applicant submit that dependent claims 5 - 21, 23 - 26, 28, 29 and 31 - 46 are also allowable for at least this reason.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2, 5 - 21, 23 - 29 and 31 - 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Authorization is hereby given to charge Deposit Account no. 03-3839 for any underpayment, or to credit any overpayments.

Please address all correspondence to the correspondent address for **Customer No. 26345 of Intellectual Docket Administrator, Gibbons P.C.**, One Gateway Center, Newark, NJ 07102. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below if the Examiner believes any issue can be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment.

Dated: February 22, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. Bean
Reg. No. 44,528
Gibbons P.C.
One Gateway Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102-5310
(973) 596-4779